

A numerical characterization of polarized manifolds $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $K_X = -(n - i)\mathcal{L}$ by the i th sectional geometric genus and the i th Δ -genus ^{*†‡}

YOSHIAKI FUKUMA

Abstract

Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension n . In this paper, by using the i th sectional geometric genus and the i th Δ -genus, we will give a numerical characterization of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $K_X = -(n - i)\mathcal{L}$ for the following cases (i) $i = 2$, (ii) $i = 3$ and $n \geq 5$, (iii) $\max\{2, \dim \text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| + 2\} \leq i \leq n - 1$.

1 Introduction

Let X be a projective variety with $\dim X = n$ defined over the field of complex numbers, and let $\mathcal{L}$ be an ample line bundle on X . Then $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is called a *polarized variety*. If X is smooth, then we say that $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a polarized *manifold*. The main purpose of this paper is to give a numerical characterization of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $K_X = -(n - i)\mathcal{L}$. Then the following is well-known:

Proposition 1.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$.*

- (1) *$(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a polarized manifold with $K_X = -(n + 1)\mathcal{L}$ (resp. $K_X = -n\mathcal{L}$) if and only if $2g(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = -2\mathcal{L}^n$ (resp. $2g(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = -\mathcal{L}^n$).*
- (2) *(See [7, (1.9) Theorem].) $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a polarized manifold with $K_X = -(n - 1)\mathcal{L}$, which is called a Del Pezzo manifold, if and only if $2g(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = 0$ and $\Delta(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$.*

(Here $g(X, \mathcal{L})$ (resp. $\Delta(X, \mathcal{L})$) denotes the sectional genus (resp. the Δ -genus) of $(X, \mathcal{L})$.)

As the next step, we want to give a numerical characterization of polarized manifolds with $K_X = -(n - i)\mathcal{L}$ and $i \geq 2$ by using some invariants of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. In [15] and [17], we define the i th sectional geometric genus $g_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ and the i th Δ -genus $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ for every integer i with $0 \leq i \leq n$. The i th sectional geometric genus (resp. the i th Δ -genus) is a generalization of the sectional genus (resp. Δ -genus), that is, $g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) = g(X, \mathcal{L})$ (resp. $\Delta_1(X, \mathcal{L}) = \Delta(X, \mathcal{L})$). So by looking at the Proposition 1.1 above carefully, the author thought maybe we were able to give a numerical characterization of polarized manifolds $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $K_X = -(n - i)\mathcal{L}$ by using the i th sectional geometric genus and the i th Δ -genus.

In this paper, as the main results, we prove the following:

Theorem 1.1 *(See Theorems 4.2.1, 4.3.1 and 4.4.1 below.) Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$. Assume that one of the following types holds:*

^{*}Key words and phrases. Polarized manifolds, Fano manifolds, sectional genus, Δ -genus, sectional geometric genus, i th Δ -genus.

[†]2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 14C20; Secondary 14J30, 14J35, 14J40, 14J45.

[‡]This research was partially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) (No.20540045), Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Japan.

- (a) $i = 2$.
- (b) $i = 3$ and $n \geq 5$.
- (c) $\max\{2, \dim \text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| + 2\} \leq i \leq n - 1$.

Then the following are equivalent one another.

- $C(i, 1)$ $K_X + (n - i)\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_X$.
- $C(i, 2)$ $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$ and $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (i - 1)\mathcal{L}^n$.
- $C(i, 3)$ $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$ and $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (i - 1)\mathcal{L}^n$.
- $C(i, 4)$ $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$ and $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (i - 1)\mathcal{L}^n$.
- $C(i, 5)$ $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$ and $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (i - 1)\mathcal{L}^n$.

The author would like to thank Dr. Hironobu Ishihara for giving some comments about this paper.

Notation and Conventions

We say that X is a *variety* if X is an integral separated scheme of finite type. In particular X is irreducible and reduced if X is a variety. Varieties are always assumed to be defined over the field of complex numbers. In this article, we shall study mainly a smooth projective variety. The words “line bundles” and “Cartier divisors” are used interchangeably. The tensor products of line bundles are denoted additively.

$\mathcal{O}(D)$: invertible sheaf associated with a Cartier divisor D on X .

$\mathcal{O}_X$: the structure sheaf of X .

$\chi(\mathcal{F})$: the Euler-Poincaré characteristic of a coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F}$.

$h^i(\mathcal{F}) := \dim H^i(X, \mathcal{F})$ for a coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on X .

$h^i(D) := h^i(\mathcal{O}(D))$ for a Cartier divisor D .

$q(X) (= h^1(\mathcal{O}_X))$: the irregularity of X .

$h^i(X, \mathbb{C}) := \dim H^i(X, \mathbb{C})$.

$b_i(X) := h^i(X, \mathbb{C})$.

K_X : the canonical divisor of X .

$\mathbb{P}^n$: the projective space of dimension n .

$\mathbb{Q}^n$: a quadric hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$.

$\sim$ (or $=$): linear equivalence.

$\det(\mathcal{E}) := \wedge^r \mathcal{E}$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is a vector bundle of rank r on X .

$\mathbb{P}_X(\mathcal{E})$: the projective space bundle associated with a vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ on X .

$H(\mathcal{E})$: the tautological line bundle on $\mathbb{P}_X(\mathcal{E})$.

$\mathcal{F}^\vee := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}_X)$.

$c_i(\mathcal{E})$: the i -th Chern class of a vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$.

$c_i(X) := c_i(\mathcal{T}_X)$, where $\mathcal{T}_X$ is the tangent bundle of a smooth projective variety X .

For a real number m and a non-negative integer n , let

$$[m]^n := \begin{cases} m(m+1) \cdots (m+n-1) & \text{if } n \geq 1, \\ 1 & \text{if } n = 0. \end{cases}$$

$$[m]_n := \begin{cases} m(m-1) \cdots (m-n+1) & \text{if } n \geq 1, \\ 1 & \text{if } n = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then for n fixed, $[m]^n$ and $[m]_n$ are polynomials in m whose degree are n .

For any non-negative integer n ,

$$n! := \begin{cases} [n]_n & \text{if } n \geq 1, \\ 1 & \text{if } n = 0. \end{cases}$$

Assume that m and n are integers with $n \geq 0$. Then we put

$$\binom{m}{n} := \frac{[m]_n}{n!}$$

We note that $\binom{m}{n} = 0$ if $0 \leq m < n$, and $\binom{m}{0} = 1$.

2 Preliminaries

Here we list up some facts which will be used later.

Definition 2.1 (1) Let X (resp. Y) be an n -dimensional projective manifold, and let $\mathcal{L}$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}$) be an ample line bundle on X (resp. Y). Then $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is called a *simple blowing up of $(Y, \mathcal{A})$* if there exists a birational morphism $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ such that π is a blowing up at a point of Y and $\mathcal{L} = \pi^*(\mathcal{A}) - E$, where E is the exceptional divisor.

(2) Let X (resp. M) be an n -dimensional projective manifold, and let $\mathcal{L}$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}$) be an ample line bundle on X (resp. M). Then we say that $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a *reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$* if $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is obtained by a composite of simple blowing ups of $(M, \mathcal{A})$, and $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is not obtained by a simple blowing up of any polarized manifold. The morphism $\mu : X \rightarrow M$ is called the *reduction map*.

Definition 2.2 Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension n . We say that $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a *scroll* (resp. *quadric fibration*, *Del Pezzo fibration*) *over a normal projective variety Y with $\dim Y = m$* if there exists a surjective morphism with connected fibers $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $K_X + (n - m + 1)\mathcal{L} = f^*\mathcal{A}$ (resp. $K_X + (n - m)\mathcal{L} = f^*\mathcal{A}$, $K_X + (n - m - 1)\mathcal{L} = f^*\mathcal{A}$) for some ample line bundle $\mathcal{A}$ on Y .

Remark 2.1 If $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a scroll over a smooth curve C (resp. a smooth projective surface S) with $\dim X = n \geq 3$, then by [6, (3.2.1) Theorem] and [5, Proposition 3.2.1 and Theorem 14.1.1] there exists an ample vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ of rank n (resp. $n - 1$) on C (resp. S) such that $(X, \mathcal{L}) \cong (\mathbb{P}_C(\mathcal{E}), H(\mathcal{E}))$ (resp. $(\mathbb{P}_S(\mathcal{E}), H(\mathcal{E}))$).

Theorem 2.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold with $\dim X = n \geq 3$. Then $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is one of the following types.*

- (1) $(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1))$.
- (2) $(\mathbb{Q}^n, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}^n}(1))$.
- (3) *A scroll over a smooth projective curve.*
- (4) $K_X \sim -(n - 1)\mathcal{L}$, *that is, $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a Del Pezzo manifold.*
- (5) *A quadric fibration over a smooth curve.*
- (6) *A scroll over a smooth projective surface.*
- (7) *Let $(M, \mathcal{A})$ be a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$.*
 - (7.1) $n = 4$, $(M, \mathcal{A}) = (\mathbb{P}^4, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2))$.
 - (7.2) $n = 3$, $(M, \mathcal{A}) = (\mathbb{Q}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}^3}(2))$.
 - (7.3) $n = 3$, $(M, \mathcal{A}) = (\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3))$.
 - (7.4) $n = 3$, M is a $\mathbb{P}^2$ -bundle over a smooth curve C and for any fiber F' of it, $(F', \mathcal{A}|_{F'}) \cong (\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2))$.
 - (7.5) $K_M \sim -(n - 2)\mathcal{A}$, *that is, $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a Mukai manifold.*

(7.6) $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a Del Pezzo fibration over a smooth curve.

(7.7) $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a quadric fibration over a normal surface.

(7.8) $n \geq 4$ and $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety of dimension 3.

(7.9) $K_M + (n - 2)\mathcal{A}$ is nef and big.

Proof. See [5, Proposition 7.2.2, Theorem 7.2.4, Theorem 7.3.2, Theorem 7.3.4, and Theorem 7.5.3]. See also [10, Chapter II, (11.2), (11.7), and (11.8)]. $\square$

Remark 2.2 Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold with $\dim X = n \geq 3$.

- (1) $\kappa(K_X + (n - 2)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$ if and only if $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is one of the types from (1) to (7.4) in Theorem 2.1.
- (2) $\kappa(K_X + (n - 2)\mathcal{L}) = 0$ if and only if $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is (7.5) in Theorem 2.1.
- (3) $\kappa(K_X + (n - 2)\mathcal{L}) \geq 1$ if and only if $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is one of the types from (7.6) to (7.9) in Theorem 2.1.

Definition 2.3 ([5, 7.5.7 Definition-Notation]) Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, and let $(M, \mathcal{A})$ be a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. Assume that $K_M + (n - 2)\mathcal{A}$ is nef and big. Then for large $m \gg 0$ the morphism $\varphi : M \rightarrow W$ associated to $|m(K_M + (n - 2)\mathcal{A})|$ has connected fibers and normal image W . Then we note that there exists an ample line bundle $\mathcal{K}$ on W such that $K_M + (n - 2)\mathcal{A} = \varphi^*(\mathcal{K})$. Let $\mathcal{D} := (\varphi_*\mathcal{A})^{\vee\vee}$, where $^{\vee\vee}$ denotes the double dual. Then the pair $(W, \mathcal{D})$ together with φ is called the *second reduction* of $(X, \mathcal{L})$.

Remark 2.3 (1) If $K_M + (n - 2)\mathcal{A}$ is nef and big but not ample, then φ is equal to the nef value morphism of $\mathcal{A}$.

(2) If $K_M + (n - 2)\mathcal{A}$ is ample, then φ is an isomorphism.

(3) If $n \geq 4$, then W has isolated terminal singularities and is 2-factorial. Moreover if n is even, then X is Gorenstein (see [5, Proposition 7.5.6]).

Here we consider the characterization of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $\kappa(K_X + (n - 3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$. We note that $\kappa(K_X + (n - 1)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$ (resp. $\kappa(K_X + (n - 2)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$) if and only if $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is one of the types from (1) to (3) (resp. from (1) to (7.4)) in Theorem 2.1. Here we consider the case where $\kappa(K_X + (n - 3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$. If $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is one of the types from (1) to (7.8) in Theorem 2.1, then $\kappa(K_X + (n - 3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$ holds. So we assume that $K_M + (n - 2)\mathcal{A}$ is nef and big. Then there exist a normal projective variety W with only 2-factorial isolated terminal singularities, a birational morphism $\phi_2 : M \rightarrow W$ and an ample line bundle $\mathcal{K}$ on W such that $K_M + (n - 2)\mathcal{A} = (\phi_2)^*(\mathcal{K})$. Let $\mathcal{D} := (\phi_{2*}\mathcal{A})^{\vee\vee}$. Then $\mathcal{D}$ is a 2-Cartier divisor on W and $\mathcal{K} = K_W + (n - 2)\mathcal{D}$ (see [5, Lemma 7.5.8]). Then the pair $(W, \mathcal{D})$ is the second reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ (see Definition 2.3). Here we note that if $K_M + (n - 2)\mathcal{A}$ is ample, then $(W, \mathcal{K}) \cong (M, K_M + (n - 2)\mathcal{A})$.

Then the following properties hold:

- (1) $\kappa(K_X + (n - 3)\mathcal{L}) = \kappa(K_W + (n - 3)\mathcal{K})$ holds [5, Corollary 7.6.2].
- (2) $(n - 2)(K_W + (n - 3)\mathcal{D}) = K_W + (n - 3)\mathcal{K}$ and $K_M + (n - 3)\mathcal{A} = \phi_2^*(K_W + (n - 3)\mathcal{D}) + \Delta$ for an exceptional $\mathbb{Q}$ -effective divisor Δ of ϕ_2 . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} m(n - 2)(K_X + (n - 3)\mathcal{L}) &= m(n - 2)\phi_1^*(K_M + (n - 3)\mathcal{A}) + E_1 \\ &= m(n - 2)\phi_1^* \circ \phi_2^*(K_W + (n - 3)\mathcal{D}) + E_1 + m(n - 2)\Delta \\ &= m\phi_1^* \circ \phi_2^*(K_W + (n - 3)\mathcal{K}) + E_1 + m(n - 2)\Delta. \end{aligned}$$

(Here $\phi_1 : X \rightarrow M$ is a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ and E_1 is a ϕ_1 -exceptional effective divisor.)

(3) $h^0((n-2)m(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L})) = h^0(m(K_W + (n-3)\mathcal{K}))$ for every integer m with $m \geq 1$.

Moreover if $n \geq 4$, then there exists a normal factorial projective variety $M^\sharp$ with only isolated terminal singularities and birational morphisms $\phi_2^\sharp : M \rightarrow M^\sharp$ and $\psi : M^\sharp \rightarrow W$ such that $\phi_2 = \psi \circ \phi_2^\sharp$. Then $M^\sharp$ is called the *factorial stage* (see [5, 7.5.7 Definition-Notation] or [11, (2.6)]).

If $\tau(\mathcal{K}) \leq n-3$, then by above we see that $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) \geq 0$. (Here $\tau(\mathcal{K})$ denotes the nef value of $\mathcal{K}$.) So we may assume that $\tau(\mathcal{K}) > n-3$.

If $n \geq 5$, then $(W, \mathcal{K})$ with $\tau(\mathcal{K}) > n-3$ is one of some special types by [5, Theorems 7.7.2, 7.7.3 and 7.7.5]. So we can get the following:

Proposition 2.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 5$, $(M, \mathcal{A})$ a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$, and $(W, \mathcal{K})$ the second reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. Then $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$ if and only if $(X, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies one of the following:*

(1) $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is one of the types (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7.5), (7.6), (7.7) or (7.8) in Theorem 2.1.

(2) $K_M + (n-2)\mathcal{A}$ is nef and big, and $(W, \mathcal{K})$ is one of the following:

(2.1) $(\mathbb{P}^6, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^6}(1))$.

(2.2) 1, 2 or 3 in [5, Theorem 7.7.5].

Proof. See [5, Theorems 7.7.2, 7.7.3, 7.7.5 and Proposition 7.7.9]. $\square$

So we consider the case of $n = 4$. In this case $M^\sharp$ and W are Gorenstein (see [5, Proposition 7.5.6 and 7.5.7 Definition-Notation]). Then by the proof of [11, Section 4] we see that $(W, \mathcal{K})$ or $M^\sharp$ is one of the types in [11, (4. ∞)]. If $(W, \mathcal{K})$ or $M^\sharp$ is either (4.2), (4.4.0), (4.4.1), (4.4.2), (4.6.0.0), (4.6.0.1.0), (4.6.0.2.1), (4.6.1), (4.7) or (4.8.0) in [11, (4. ∞)], then we see that $\kappa(K_X + \mathcal{L}) = -\infty$.

Assume that $(W, \mathcal{K})$ is the type (4.4.4) in [11, (4. ∞)]. Then we note that $\tau(\mathcal{K}) = 3$ and there exist a normal Gorenstein projective variety W_2 , an ample line bundle $\mathcal{K}_2$ on W_2 and a birational morphism $\mu : W \rightarrow W_2$ such that μ is the simultaneous contraction to distinct smooth points of divisors $E_i \cong \mathbb{P}^3$ such that $E_i \subset \text{reg}(W)$, $E_i|_{E_i} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)$, $K_W + 3\mathcal{K} = \mu^*(K_{W_2} + 3\mathcal{K}_2)$ and $K_{W_2} + 3\mathcal{K}_2$ is ample, that is, $\tau(\mathcal{K}_2) < 3$. Moreover we infer that W_2 has the same singularities as W by above. Since $E_i \subset \text{reg}(W)$, we have $\psi^{-1}(E_i) \cong E_i$ by the definition of ψ . Hence there exist a normal Gorenstein projective variety $W_2^\sharp$ and birational morphisms $\mu^\sharp : M^\sharp \rightarrow W_2^\sharp$ and $\psi^\sharp : W_2^\sharp \rightarrow W_2$ such that $\mu \circ \psi = \psi^\sharp \circ \mu^\sharp$. We note that $\mu^\sharp : M^\sharp \rightarrow W_2^\sharp$ is the contraction of $\psi^{-1}(E_i)$ and $W_2^\sharp$ has the same singularities as $M^\sharp$. The pair $(W_2, \mathcal{K}_2)$ is a reduction of $(W, \mathcal{K})$ and is called the $2\frac{1}{2}$ reduction of $(W, \mathcal{K})$ in [4, (2.2) Theorem-Definition]. We also note that $h^j(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_M) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_W) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_{W_2}) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_{M^\sharp}) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_{W_2^\sharp})$. For this $\psi^\sharp : W_2^\sharp \rightarrow W_2$ and $(W_2, \mathcal{K}_2)$, we can apply the same argument as in [11, Section 4]. If $\tau(\mathcal{K}_2) \leq 1$, then we can prove that $\kappa(K_X + \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$. So we assume that $\tau(\mathcal{K}_2) > 1$. Then $(W_2, \mathcal{K}_2)$ is either (4.6.0.0), (4.6.0.1.0), (4.6.0.2.1), (4.6.1), (4.6.4), (4.7) or (4.8.0) in [11, (4. ∞)].

If $(W_2, \mathcal{K}_2)$ is either (4.6.0.0), (4.6.0.1.0), (4.6.0.2.1), (4.6.1), (4.7) or (4.8.0) in [11, (4. ∞)], then we see that $\kappa(K_X + \mathcal{L}) = -\infty$.

If $(W_2, \mathcal{K}_2)$ is the type (4.6.4) in [11, (4. ∞)], then by the same argument as in [11, Section 4] we see that there exist a normal Gorenstein projective variety W_3 , an ample line bundle $\mathcal{K}_3$ on W_3 and a birational morphism $\mu_2 : W_2 \rightarrow W_3$ such that W_3 has the same singularities as W_2 , $K_{W_2} + 2\mathcal{K}_2 = \mu_2^*(K_{W_3} + 2\mathcal{K}_3)$ and $K_{W_3} + 2\mathcal{K}_3$ is ample, that is, $\tau(\mathcal{K}_3) < 2$. Here we note that $\kappa(K_X + \mathcal{L}) = \kappa(K_{W_2} + \mathcal{K}_2) = \kappa(K_{W_3} + \mathcal{K}_3)$.

If $\tau(\mathcal{K}_3) \leq 1$, then $\kappa(K_X + \mathcal{L}) = \kappa(K_{W_3} + \mathcal{K}_3) \geq 0$.

If $\tau(\mathcal{K}_3) > 1$, then $(W_3, \mathcal{K}_3)$ is either (4.7) or (4.8.0) by the same argument as in [11, Section 4] and we have $\kappa(K_X + \mathcal{L}) = \kappa(K_{W_3} + \mathcal{K}_3) = -\infty$.

By the above argument, we get the following:

Theorem 2.2 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n = 4$.*

(1) *The inequality $\kappa(K_X + \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$ holds if and only if there exist a normal projective variety W_3 with only isolated terminal singularities, an ample line bundle $\mathcal{K}_3$ on W_3 , and a birational morphism $\Phi : X \rightarrow W_3$ such that $\tau(\mathcal{K}_3) \leq 1$ and $h^0(2m(K_X + \mathcal{L})) = h^0(m(K_{W_3} + \mathcal{K}_3))$ for every positive integer m .*

(2) *The equality $\kappa(K_X + \mathcal{L}) = -\infty$ holds if and only if $(X, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies one of the following:*

- (2.1) *The pair $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is either (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7.1), (7.5), (7.6), (7.7) or (7.8) in Theorem 2.1.*
- (2.2) *There exist a normal projective variety W_3 with only isolated terminal singularities, an ample line bundle $\mathcal{K}_3$ on W_3 , and a birational morphism $\Phi : X \rightarrow W_3$ such that $(W_3, \mathcal{K}_3)$ is either (4.2), (4.4.0), (4.4.1), (4.4.2), (4.6.0.0), (4.6.0.1.0), (4.6.0.2.1), (4.6.1), (4.7) or (4.8.0) in [11, (4.∞)].*

Furthermore we need the following two lemmas.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 4$, and let $(M, \mathcal{A})$ be a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. If $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$, then $h^j(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ for any j with $j \geq 3$ unless $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety of dimension 3. If $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety of dimension 3, then $h^j(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_M) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq 4$.*

Proof. (I) First we assume that $n \geq 5$. By assumption and Proposition 2.1, $(X, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies either (1), (2.1) or (2.2) in Proposition 2.1. Here we note that since $h^j(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_M) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_W)$, we have only to prove that $h^j(\mathcal{O}_W) = 0$. But by Proposition 2.1 it is easy to show this and left to the reader.

(II) Next we assume that $n = 4$. By Theorem 2.2, $(X, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies either (2.1) or (2.2) in Theorem 2.2. Here we use notation above. Here we note that $h^j(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_M) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_W) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_{W_2}) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_{W_3}) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_{M^\sharp}) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_{W^\sharp})$.

(II.A) If $(W_3, \mathcal{K}_3)$ is a $(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2))$ -fibration over a smooth curve C , then there exists an extremal ray R such that $(K_{W_3} + 2\mathcal{K}_3)R = 0$ (see [11, (4.6.1)]). Let ρ be the contraction morphism of R . Then $\dim \rho(X) = 1$, $\rho(X) = C$ and $\rho : X \rightarrow C$ is the $(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2))$ -fibration. Moreover there exists a line bundle $\mathcal{B}$ on C such that $K_{W_3} + 2\mathcal{K}_3 = \rho^*(\mathcal{B})$. Since $\mathcal{K}_3$ is ample, by [25, Theorem 1-2-5] we see that $R^j \rho_*(K_{W_3} + 2\mathcal{K}_3) = 0$ for every integer j with $j > 0$. Hence $0 = R^j \rho_*(\rho^*(\mathcal{B})) \cong R^j \rho_*(\mathcal{O}_{W_3}) \otimes \mathcal{B}$ and we have $R^j \rho_*(\mathcal{O}_{W_3}) = 0$ for every positive integer j . Therefore $h^j(\mathcal{O}_{W_3}) = h^j(\rho_*(\mathcal{O}_{W_3}))$. On the other hand $h^j(\rho_*(\mathcal{O}_{W_3})) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq 2$. Therefore $h^j(\mathcal{O}_{W_3}) = 0$ for every $j \geq 2$.

(II.B) Assume that $(W_3, \mathcal{K}_3)$ is the cone over $(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2))$. Then the following holds: Let $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)$, $P := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(\mathcal{E})$ and $H(\mathcal{E})$ the tautological line bundle on P . Let $\pi : P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$ be the morphism associated to $H(\mathcal{E})$. Then $W_3 = \pi(P)$ (see [5, 1.1.8 in Chapter I]). First we note that $h^j(\mathcal{O}_P) \geq h^j(\mathcal{O}_{W_3})$ for every nonnegative integer j . On the other hand $h^j(\mathcal{O}_P) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq 1$. Therefore we get $h^j(\mathcal{O}_{W_3}) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq 1$.

(II.C) For other cases it is easy and left to the reader. $\square$

Lemma 2.2 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, and let $(M, \mathcal{A})$ be a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. Assume that $K_M + (n-2)\mathcal{A}$ is nef and big. Let $(W, \mathcal{D})$ be the second reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ and $\varphi : M \rightarrow W$ its morphism. (Here we use notation in Definition 2.3.) Then $h^j(\mathcal{A}) = h^j(\mathcal{D})$ for every integer $j \geq 3$.*

Proof. As we said in Definition 2.3, there exists an ample line bundle $\mathcal{K}$ on Y such that $K_M + (n-2)\mathcal{A} = \varphi^*(\mathcal{K})$. By [25, Theorem 1-2-5] we have $R^j\varphi_*(K_M + (n-1)\mathcal{A}) = 0$. On the other hand $R^j\varphi_*\mathcal{O}(K_M + (n-1)\mathcal{A}) = R^j\varphi_*(\varphi^*(\mathcal{K}) \otimes \mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{K} \otimes R^j\varphi_*(\mathcal{A})$. Therefore $R^j\varphi_*(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and we have $h^j(\mathcal{A}) = h^j(\varphi_*(\mathcal{A}))$ for every positive integer j .

Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a line bundle on M , we see that $\varphi_*(\mathcal{A})$ is a torsion free coherent sheaf on W . Then there exists an injective homomorphism $\mu : \varphi_*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\varphi_*(\mathcal{A}))^{\vee\vee}$. Hence we get the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \varphi_*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\varphi_*(\mathcal{A}))^{\vee\vee} \rightarrow \text{Coker}\mu \rightarrow 0.$$

Here we note that $\dim \text{Supp}(\text{Coker}\mu) \leq 1$ because there exists a closed subset Z on W such that $\dim Z \leq 1$ and $M \setminus \varphi^{-1}(Z) \cong W \setminus Z$. Therefore $h^j(\text{Coker}\mu) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq 2$ by [22, Theorem 2.7 in Chapter III] or [23, Theorem 4.6*]. Hence we have $h^j(\varphi_*(\mathcal{A})) = h^j((\varphi_*(\mathcal{A}))^{\vee\vee})$ for every integer j with $j \geq 3$. Since $\mathcal{D} = (\varphi_*(\mathcal{A}))^{\vee\vee}$, we get the assertion. $\square$

Definition 2.4 Let X be a smooth projective variety and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a vector bundle on X . Then for every integer j with $j \geq 0$, the j -th Segre class $s_j(\mathcal{F})$ of $\mathcal{F}$ is defined by the following equation: $c_t(\mathcal{F}^\vee)s_t(\mathcal{F}) = 1$, where $c_t(\mathcal{F}^\vee)$ is the Chern polynomial of $\mathcal{F}^\vee$ and $s_t(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{j \geq 0} s_j(\mathcal{F})t^j$.

Remark 2.4 (1) Let X be a smooth projective variety and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a vector bundle on X . Let $\tilde{s}_j(\mathcal{F})$ be the Segre class which is defined in [21, Chapter 3]. Then $s_j(\mathcal{F}) = \tilde{s}_j(\mathcal{F}^\vee)$.
(2) For every integer i with $1 \leq i$, $s_i(\mathcal{F})$ can be written by using the Chern classes $c_j(\mathcal{F})$ with $1 \leq j \leq i$. (For example, $s_1(\mathcal{F}) = c_1(\mathcal{F})$, $s_2(\mathcal{F}) = c_1(\mathcal{F})^2 - c_2(\mathcal{F})$, and so on.)

3 Review on the i th sectional geometric genus and the i th Δ -genus of polarized varieties.

Here we are going to review the i th sectional geometric genus and the i th Δ -genus of polarized varieties $(X, \mathcal{L})$ for every integer i with $0 \leq i \leq \dim X$. Up to now, there are many investigations of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ via the sectional genus and the Δ -genus. In order to analyze $(X, \mathcal{L})$ more deeply, the author extended these notions. In [15, Definition 2.1] we defined an invariant called the i th sectional geometric genus which is thought to be a generalization of the sectional genus. First we recall the definition of this invariant.

Notation 3.1 Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized variety of dimension n , and let $\chi(t\mathcal{L})$ be the Euler-Poincaré characteristic of $t\mathcal{L}$. Then $\chi(t\mathcal{L})$ is a polynomial in t of degree n , and we can describe this as

$$\chi(t\mathcal{L}) = \sum_{j=0}^n \chi_j(X, \mathcal{L}) \binom{t+j-1}{j}.$$

Definition 3.1 ([15, Definition 2.1]) Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized variety of dimension n . Then for any integer i with $0 \leq i \leq n$ the i th sectional geometric genus $g_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is defined by the following.

$$g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = (-1)^i (\chi_{n-i}(X, \mathcal{L}) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_X)) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-i} (-1)^{n-i-j} h^{n-j}(\mathcal{O}_X).$$

Remark 3.1 (1) Since $\chi_{n-i}(X, \mathcal{L}) \in \mathbb{Z}$, the invariant $g_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ is an integer by definition.

(2) If $i = \dim X = n$, then $g_n(X, \mathcal{L}) = h^n(\mathcal{O}_X)$ and $g_n(X, \mathcal{L})$ is independent of $\mathcal{L}$.

(3) If $i = 0$, then $g_0(X, \mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}^n$.

- (4) If $i = 1$, then $g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) = g(\mathcal{L})$, where $g(\mathcal{L})$ is the sectional genus of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. If X is smooth, then $g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1 + (1/2)(K_X + (n-1)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1}$, where K_X denotes the canonical line bundle on X .
- (5) Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension n and let $(M, \mathcal{A})$ be a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. Then $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_i(M, \mathcal{A})$ for every integer i with $1 \leq i \leq n$.

The following are main problems about the i th sectional geometric genus.

Problem 3.1 (i) *Does the i th sectional geometric genus have a property similar to that of the sectional genus? For example, there are the following two questions.*

- (i.1) *Does $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$ hold? More strongly, does $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) \geq h^i(\mathcal{O}_X)$ hold?*
- (i.2) *Can we get the i th sectional geometric genus version of the theory on sectional genus?*
- (ii) *Are there any relationship between $g_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ and $g_{i+1}(X, \mathcal{L})$?*
- (iii) *Classify $(X, \mathcal{L})$ by the value of the i th sectional geometric genus.*
- (iv) *What is the geometric meaning of the i th sectional geometric genus?*

Remark 3.2 (1) First we consider Problem 3.1 (i.1). At present we can prove that the non-negativity of $g_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ holds if (a) $i = 0$, (b) $i = 1$, (c) $i = 2$ and $n = 3$, (d) $i = n$. But in general it is unknown whether $g_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ is non-negative or not. Next we consider the second inequality. Of course, if the second inequality holds, then non-negativity of $g_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ also holds. If $i = 0$ or n , then this inequality holds. But it is unknown whether this inequality holds or not in general. If $i = 1$, then this is a conjecture proposed by Fujita [10, (13.7) Remark], and this case has been studied for several cases (see, for example, [12], [13], [14] and so on). In [16, Corollary 2.8], we showed that the second inequality holds if $\dim \text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| + 1 \leq i \leq n - 1$.

(2) Next we consider Problem 3.1 (ii). If $\text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| = \emptyset$, then $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ implies $g_{i+1}(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$.

(3) Next we consider Problem 3.1 (iii). If $i = 1$, then the classification of polarized manifolds $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) \leq 2$ was obtained (see [8], [24], [3], and [9]).

If $i = 2$, then the classification of polarized manifolds $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with the following is obtained (see [15, Corollary 3.5 and Theorem 3.6] and [20]):

- (ii.1) The case where $\text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| = \emptyset$ and $g_2(X, \mathcal{L}) = h^2(\mathcal{O}_X)$.
- (ii.2) The case where $\mathcal{L}$ is very ample and $g_2(X, \mathcal{L}) = h^2(\mathcal{O}_X) + 1$.

(4) Finally we consider Problem 3.1 (iv). Namely we will explain the geometric meaning of the i th sectional geometric genus. First we will give the following definition.

Definition 3.2 Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized variety of dimension n . Then $\mathcal{L}$ has a k -ladder if there exists a sequence of irreducible and reduced subvarieties $X \supset X_1 \supset \cdots \supset X_k$ such that $X_i \in |\mathcal{L}_{i-1}|$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, where $X_0 := X$, $\mathcal{L}_0 := \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}_i := \mathcal{L}|_{X_i}$. Here we note that $\dim X_j = n - j$. Let $r_{p,q} : H^p(X_q, \mathcal{L}_q) \rightarrow H^p(X_{q+1}, \mathcal{L}_{q+1})$ be the natural map.

Theorem 3.1 ([16, Propositions 2.1 and 2.3, and Theorem 2.4]) *Let X be a projective variety of dimension $n \geq 2$ and let $\mathcal{L}$ be an ample line bundle on X . Assume that $h^t(-s\mathcal{L}) = 0$ for every integers t and s with $0 \leq t \leq n - 1$ and $1 \leq s$, and $|\mathcal{L}|$ has an $(n - i)$ -ladder for an integer i with $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then the i th sectional geometric genus has the following properties.*

- (1) $g_i(X_j, \mathcal{L}_j) = g_i(X_{j+1}, \mathcal{L}_{j+1})$ for every integer j with $0 \leq j \leq n - i - 1$. (Here we use the notation in Definition 3.2.)

$$(2) \ g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) \geq h^i(\mathcal{O}_X).$$

In particular, if $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a polarized manifold with $\text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{L}$ has an $(n-i)$ -ladder $X \supset X_1 \supset \cdots \supset X_{n-i}$ such that each X_j is smooth, and from Theorem 3.1 (1) and Remark 3.1 (2) we see that $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_i(X_{n-i}, \mathcal{L}_{n-i}) = h^i(\mathcal{O}_{X_{n-i}}) = h^0(\Omega_{X_{n-i}})$, that is, the i th sectional geometric genus is the geometric genus of i -dimensional projective variety X_{n-i} . This is a reason why we call this invariant the i th sectional geometric genus.

From Theorem 3.1 we see that the i th sectional geometric genus is expected to have properties similar to those of the geometric genus of i -dimensional projective varieties. In particular, if $i = 2$, then $g_2(X, \mathcal{L})$ is expected to have properties similar to those of the geometric genus of projective surfaces and we can propose several problems which can be considered as a generalization of theorems in the theory of surfaces. In [19], we investigated them. See [19] for further detail.

For other results concerning the i th sectional geometric genus, for example, see [15], [16], [18] and [19].

The following result will be used later.

Theorem 3.2 *Let X be a projective variety with $\dim X = n$ and let $\mathcal{L}$ be a nef and big line bundle on X .*

(1) *For any integer i with $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, we have*

$$g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-i-1} (-1)^{n-j} \binom{n-i}{j} \chi(-(n-i-j)\mathcal{L}) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-i} (-1)^{n-i-k} h^{n-k}(\mathcal{O}_X).$$

(2) *Assume that X is smooth. Then for any integer i with $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, we have*

$$g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-i-1} (-1)^j \binom{n-i}{j} h^0(K_X + (n-i-j)\mathcal{L}) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-i} (-1)^{n-i-k} h^{n-k}(\mathcal{O}_X).$$

Proof. (1) By the same argument as in the proof of [15, Theorem 2.2], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{n-i}(X, \mathcal{L}) &= \sum_{j=0}^{n-i} (-1)^{n-i-j} \binom{n-i}{j} \chi(-(n-i-j)\mathcal{L}) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{n-i-1} (-1)^{n-i-j} \binom{n-i}{j} \chi(-(n-i-j)\mathcal{L}) + \chi(\mathcal{O}_X). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Definition 3.1, we get the assertion.

(2) By using the Serre duality and the Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem, we get the assertion from (1). $\square$

Proposition 3.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 4$ and let $(M, \mathcal{A})$ be a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. If $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$, then $g_j(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_j(M, \mathcal{A}) = 0$ for every integer $j \geq 3$ unless $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety of dimension 3.*

Proof. Assume that $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is not a scroll over a normal projective variety of dimension 3. Then by Lemma 2.1 we have $h^j(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_M) = 0$ for every integer $j \geq 3$. By assumption, we get $h^0(K_M + t\mathcal{A}) = h^0(K_X + t\mathcal{L}) = 0$ for every integer t with $1 \leq t \leq n-3$. Hence by Theorem 3.2 (2) and Remark 3.1 (5) we get $g_j(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_j(M, \mathcal{A}) = 0$ for every integer $j \geq 3$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 3.3 If $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety of dimension 3, then by [15, Example 2.10 (8)] we have $g_j(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_j(M, \mathcal{A}) = 0$ for every integer $j \geq 4$ and $g_3(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_3(M, \mathcal{A}) = h^3(\mathcal{O}_M) = h^3(\mathcal{O}_X)$.

As the next step, we want to generalize the notion of the Δ -genus. Several generalizations can be considered from various point of view. Here we will give a generalization of the Δ -genus from the following point of view. For the case of $\Delta(X, \mathcal{L})$, the following result has been obtained.

Theorem 3.3 (See e.g. [10, §3 in Chapter I].) *Let X be a projective variety of dimension $n \geq 2$ and let $\mathcal{L}$ be an ample line bundle on X . We use the notation in Definition 3.2. If $|\mathcal{L}|$ has an $(n-1)$ -ladder and $h^0(\mathcal{L}_{n-1}) > 0$, then*

$$\Delta(X, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \dim \operatorname{Coker}(r_{0,j}).$$

In particular, we have $\Delta(X, \mathcal{L}) \geq \Delta(X_1, \mathcal{L}_1) \geq \cdots \geq \Delta(X_{n-1}, \mathcal{L}_{n-1}) \geq 0$.

Here we want to give the definition of the i th Δ -genus which satisfies a generalization of Theorem 3.3. Now we are going to give the definition of the i th Δ -genus.

Definition 3.3 ([17, Definition 2.1]) Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized variety of dimension n . For every integer i with $0 \leq i \leq n$, the i th Δ -genus $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is defined by the following formula:

$$\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 0, \\ g_{i-1}(X, \mathcal{L}) - \Delta_{i-1}(X, \mathcal{L}) \\ \quad + (n-i+1)h^{i-1}(\mathcal{O}_X) - h^{i-1}(\mathcal{L}) & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Remark 3.4 (1) If $i = 1$, then $\Delta_1(X, \mathcal{L})$ is equal to the Δ -genus of $(X, \mathcal{L})$.

(2) If $i = n$, then $\Delta_n(X, \mathcal{L}) = h^n(\mathcal{O}_X) - h^n(\mathcal{L})$ (see [17, Proposition 2.4]).

(3) For every integer i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, by the definition of the i th Δ -genus, we have the following equality which will be used later.

$$\Delta_{i-1}(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_{i-1}(X, \mathcal{L}) - \Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) + (n-i+1)h^{i-1}(\mathcal{O}_X) - h^{i-1}(\mathcal{L}).$$

(4) Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension n and let $(M, \mathcal{A})$ be a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. Then $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = \Delta_i(M, \mathcal{A})$ for every integer i with $2 \leq i \leq n$ (see [17, Corollary 2.11]).

Then, for the case of the i th Δ -genus, we can prove the following.

Theorem 3.4 (See [17, Theorem 2.8 and Corollary 2.9] and [16, Proposition 2.1].) *Let X be a projective variety of dimension $n \geq 2$ and let $\mathcal{L}$ be an ample line bundle on X . We use the notation in Definition 3.2. Assume that $h^t(-s\mathcal{L}) = 0$ for every integers t and s with $0 \leq t \leq n-1$ and $1 \leq s$. If $|\mathcal{L}|$ has an $(n-i)$ -ladder and $h^0(\mathcal{L}_{n-i}) > 0$ for an integer i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, then*

$$\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-i} \dim \operatorname{Coker}(r_{i-1,j}).$$

In particular, we have $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) \geq \Delta_i(X_1, \mathcal{L}_1) \geq \cdots \geq \Delta_i(X_{n-i}, \mathcal{L}_{n-i}) \geq 0$.

The definition of the i th Δ -genus is so complicated that a lot of things about the i th Δ -genus are unknown. So it is important to investigate the following problems in order to understand the meaning and properties of the i th Δ -genus.

Problem 3.2 (i) *Does the i th Δ -genus have properties similar to those of the Δ -genus? For example, there are the following two questions.*

- (i.1) Does $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$ hold ?
- (i.2) Can we get the i th Δ -genus version of the Fujita theory on Δ -genus ?
- (ii) Are there any relationship between $g_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ and $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L})$?
- (iii) Are there any relationship between $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ and $\Delta_{i+1}(X, \mathcal{L})$?
- (iv) Classify $(X, \mathcal{L})$ by the value of the i th Δ -genus.
- (v) What is the geometric meaning of the i th Δ -genus ?

Remark 3.5 If X is smooth and $\mathcal{L}$ is ample, then the following facts on Problem 3.2 are known.

- (1) First we consider Problem 3.2 (i.1). If $i = 1$, then $\Delta_1(X, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$ (see [10, (4.2) Theorem]). Moreover if $\mathcal{L}$ is base point free, then $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$ holds for every integer i with $0 \leq i \leq n$. But unfortunately, there exists an example $(X, \mathcal{L})$ such that $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) < 0$ (see [17, Section 4]).
- (2) Next we consider Problem 3.2 (ii). If $i = 1$ and $\mathcal{L}$ is merely ample, then it is known that $g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ if and only if $\Delta_1(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ (see [10, (12.1) Theorem]). Next we consider the case of $i \geq 2$. Then under the assumption that $\text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| = \emptyset$ we see that $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ if and only if $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ (see [17, Theorem 3.13]).
- (3) Next we consider Problem 3.2 (iii) under the assumption that $\mathcal{L}$ is base point free. Then, for example, we get the following: If $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) \leq i - 1$, then $\Delta_{i+1}(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ (see [17, Proposition 3.9]). In particular, if $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$, then $\Delta_{i+1}(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$. Maybe there will be several relationship between $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ and $\Delta_{i+1}(X, \mathcal{L})$ other than this.
- (4) For Problem 3.2 (iv), there exists the classification of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ by the value of $\Delta_2(X, \mathcal{L})$ as follows:
 - (4.1) The classification of polarized manifolds $(X, \mathcal{L})$ such that $\text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| = \emptyset$ and $\Delta_2(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ (see [17, Theorem 3.13 and Remark 3.13.1]).
 - (4.2) The classification of polarized manifolds $(X, \mathcal{L})$ such that $\mathcal{L}$ is very ample and $\Delta_2(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$ (see [17, Theorem 3.17] and [20, Remark 2]).
- (5) At present, we do not know much about any answer to Problem 3.2 (v). This problem seems to be the most difficult problem among the above problems even in the case where $\mathcal{L}$ is base point free or very ample.

In this paper, we consider Problem 3.1 (i.2) and Problem 3.2 (i.2). In [7, (1.9) Theorem], Fujita proved that $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a Del Pezzo manifold (namely $K_X = -(n-1)\mathcal{L}$) if and only if $g(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$ and $\Delta(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$, that is, $g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$ and $\Delta_1(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$. So in this paper, we consider an analogous characterization of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $K_X = -(n-i)\mathcal{L}$ by using $g_i(X, \mathcal{L})$ and $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L})$.

4 Main Theorems

4.1 A conjecture

First we provide the following conjecture which is the main theme of this paper.

Conjecture 4.1.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$. Then, for every integer i with $2 \leq i \leq n-1$, the following are equivalent one another.*

- $C(i, 1)$: $K_X = -(n-i)\mathcal{L}$.
- $C(i, 2)$: $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$ and $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (i-1)\mathcal{L}^n$.

$$\begin{aligned}
C(i, 3): & \Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0 \text{ and } 2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (i - 1)\mathcal{L}^n. \\
C(i, 4): & g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1 \text{ and } 2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (i - 1)\mathcal{L}^n. \\
C(i, 5): & g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0 \text{ and } 2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (i - 1)\mathcal{L}^n.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.1.1 If $i = 1$, then $C(1, 1)$ and $C(1, 2)$ in Conjecture 4.1.1 are equivalent each other for any ample line bundle $\mathcal{L}$. Of course $C(1, 1)$ implies $C(1, 3)$ (resp. $C(1, 4)$, $C(1, 5)$). But $C(1, 3)$ (resp. $C(1, 4)$, $C(1, 5)$) does not imply $C(1, 1)$ because $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is possibly a scroll over an elliptic curve.

Remark 4.1.2 As a generalization of the case where $i = 1$, it is natural to consider that $C(i, 1)$ is equivalent to the following condition:

$$C(i, 6): \Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1 \text{ and } g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1.$$

We can easily see that $C(i, 1)$ implies $C(i, 6)$. But from the following examples (Examples 4.1.1 and 4.1.2) we see that its converse is not true in general.

Example 4.1.1 Let n be a natural number with $n \geq 3$, and let Y be a smooth projective variety of dimension m with $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an ample line bundle on Y such that $K_Y \neq -(n - m - 1)\mathcal{H}$ and $h^0(K_Y + (n - m - 1)\mathcal{H}) = 1$. (There exists a polarized manifold $(Y, \mathcal{H})$ like this. For example, let Y be a principally polarized Abelian variety with $\dim Y = m = n - 2$ and let $\mathcal{H}$ be an ample line bundle on Y such that $\mathcal{H}^m = m!$. Then $K_Y + (n - m - 1)\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}$ and $h^0(K_Y + (n - m - 1)\mathcal{H}) = h^0(\mathcal{H}) = 1$.)

Next we take a Del Pezzo manifold $(F, \mathcal{A})$ of dimension $n - m$. Then we note that $K_F = -(n - m - 1)\mathcal{A}$.

Here we set $X := Y \times F$ and $L := p_1^*(\mathcal{H}) \otimes p_2^*(\mathcal{A})$, where p_i denotes the i th projection map. Then $K_X + (n - m - 1)\mathcal{L} = p_1^*(K_Y + (n - m - 1)\mathcal{H})$. By [17, Lemma 1.6] we also get $h^j(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ and $h^j(\mathcal{L}) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq m + 1$. Hence $\Delta_n(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ by Remark 3.4 (2), and by Theorem 3.2 (2) we see that $g_j(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq m + 2$ and $g_{m+1}(X, \mathcal{L}) = h^0(K_X + (n - m - 1)\mathcal{L}) = 1$. Moreover by Remark 3.4 (3) we see that $\Delta_j(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ for every integer $j \geq m + 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta_{m+1}(X, \mathcal{L}) \\
&= g_{m+1}(X, \mathcal{L}) - \Delta_{m+2}(X, \mathcal{L}) + (n - m - 1)h^{m+1}(\mathcal{O}_X) - h^{m+1}(\mathcal{L}) \\
&= 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $g_{m+1}(X, \mathcal{L}) = \Delta_{m+1}(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$. But $K_X \neq -(n - m - 1)\mathcal{L}$ and this $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is an example.

Example 4.1.2 Let k be a natural number with $k \geq 2$ and set $n := 2k + 1$ and $i := (n - 1)/2$. Here we consider $(M, \mathcal{A}) = (\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2))$. Then $K_M = -(k + 1)\mathcal{A} = -(n - i)\mathcal{A}$. Moreover we see that $g_i(M, \mathcal{A}) = 1$ and $\Delta_i(M, \mathcal{A}) = 1$ (see (I) in the proof of Theorem 4.2.1 below). Let $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ be the blowing up at a general point on $\mathbb{P}^n$ and let $\mathcal{L} := \pi^*(\mathcal{A}) - E$, where E is the exceptional divisor. Then by [1, Theorem 0.1], we see that $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a polarized manifold with $K_X + (n - i)\mathcal{L} = (i - 1)E$. On the other hand, we note that $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ and $2 \leq i < n - 1$. Hence by Remarks 3.1 (5) and 3.4 (4) we get $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_i(M, \mathcal{A}) = 1$ and $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = \Delta_i(M, \mathcal{A}) = 1$.

4.2 The case where $\max\{2, \dim \text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| + 2\} \leq i \leq n - 1$

First we consider the case where $\max\{2, \dim \text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| + 2\} \leq i \leq n - 1$.

Theorem 4.2.1 Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, and let $m = \dim \text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}|$. (If $\text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| = \emptyset$, then we set $m = -1$.) Assume that i is an integer with $\max\{2, m + 2\} \leq i \leq n - 1$. Then Conjecture 4.1.1 is true.

Proof. By assumption and [16, Proposition 1.12 (2)], we see that the following hold:

- (A_i) $\mathcal{L}$ has an $(n-i)$ -ladder $X_{n-i} \subset \cdots \subset X_1 \subset X$.
- (B_i) $h^0(\mathcal{L}_{n-i}) > 0$.
- (C) $h^j(\mathcal{L}^{\otimes -t}) = 0$ for any j and t with $0 \leq j \leq n-1$ and $t > 0$.
- (D_i) X_j is normal for any j with $0 \leq j \leq n-i$.
- (E_i) X_j is Cohen-Macaulay for any j with $0 \leq j \leq n-i$.

(I) Assume that $C(i, 1)$ holds. Then by Remark 3.1 (4) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 &= (K_X + (n-i)\mathcal{L} + (i-1)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1} \\ &= (i-1)\mathcal{L}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Here we note that $h^j(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ and $h^j(\mathcal{L}) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq 2$. Moreover $h^0(K_X + (n-i)\mathcal{L}) = 1$ and $h^0(K_X + k\mathcal{L}) = 0$ for every integer k with $1 \leq k \leq n-i-1$. Hence we see that $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$ and $g_k(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ for every integer k with $k \geq i+1$ by Theorem 3.2 (2) (this means that $C(i, 1)$ implies $C(i, 4)$), and by Remark 3.4 (2) and (3), we have $\Delta_k(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ for every integer k with $k \geq i+1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) &= g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) - \Delta_{i+1}(X, \mathcal{L}) + (n-i)h^i(\mathcal{O}_X) - h^i(\mathcal{L}) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we see that $C(i, 1)$ implies $C(i, 2)$ and $C(i, 4)$ above.

(II) It is trivial that $C(i, 2)$ implies $C(i, 3)$, and $C(i, 4)$ implies $C(i, 5)$.

(III) Assume that $C(i, 3)$ holds. Then we will prove that $C(i, 5)$ holds. In order to prove $C(i, 5)$, it suffices to show that $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$. Here we note that $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$ by [16, Theorem 2.4]. Assume that $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$. Here we prove the following.

Claim 4.2.1 *If $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$, then $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$.*

Proof. Assume that $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$. Then $0 = g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_i(X_{n-i}, \mathcal{L}_{n-i}) = h^i(\mathcal{O}_{X_{n-i}})$ by Theorem 3.1 and Remark 3.1 (2). Therefore $h^i(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^i(\mathcal{O}_{X_1}) = \cdots = h^i(\mathcal{O}_{X_{n-i-1}}) \leq h^i(\mathcal{O}_{X_{n-i}}) = 0$ by [16, Proposition 2.1 (b)]. Hence $H^{i-1}(\mathcal{L}_j) \rightarrow H^{i-1}(\mathcal{L}_{j+1})$ is surjective for $0 \leq j \leq n-i$. Namely $\dim \text{Coker}(r_{i-1,j}) = 0$ for $0 \leq j \leq n-i$. On the other hand by Theorem 3.4, we have

$$\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-i} \dim \text{Coker}(r_{i-1,k}).$$

Therefore we get

$$\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-i} \dim \text{Coker}(r_{i-1,k}) = 0.$$

This completes the proof of Claim 4.2.1. $\square$

But this contradicts the assumption. Therefore $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$ and we see that $C(i, 5)$ holds.

(IV) Assume that $C(i, 5)$ holds. Then

$$1 + \frac{1}{2}(i-1)\mathcal{L}^n = g_1(X, \mathcal{L})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 1 + \frac{1}{2}(K_X + (n-1)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1} \\
&= 1 + \frac{1}{2}(K_{X_{n-i}} + (i-1)\mathcal{L}_{n-i})\mathcal{L}_{n-i}^{i-1} \\
&= 1 + \frac{1}{2}(i-1)\mathcal{L}^n + \frac{1}{2}K_{X_{n-i}}\mathcal{L}_{n-i}^{i-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $K_{X_{n-i}}\mathcal{L}_{n-i}^{i-1} = 0$. On the other hand, we get $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = h^i(\mathcal{O}_{X_{n-i}})$ by (A_i) and (C) (see also [16, Propositions 2.1 and 2.3]). Furthermore by (D_i) , (E_i) and the Serre duality, we obtain $h^0(K_{X_{n-i}}) = h^i(\mathcal{O}_{X_{n-i}})$. Hence we have $0 < g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) = h^i(\mathcal{O}_{X_{n-i}}) = h^0(K_{X_{n-i}})$. Hence we see that $K_{X_{n-i}} = \mathcal{O}_{X_{n-i}}$.

Next we prove the following claim.

Claim 4.2.2 *A natural map $\text{Pic}(X_j) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(X_{j+1})$ is injective for any j with $0 \leq j \leq n-i-1$.*

Proof. From the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_j} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_j}^* \rightarrow 0,$$

we get the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
H^1(X_j, \mathbb{Z}) & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{O}_{X_j}) & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{O}_{X_j}^*) & \longrightarrow & H^2(X_j, \mathbb{Z}) \\
\varphi_1 \downarrow & & \varphi_2 \downarrow & & \varphi_3 \downarrow & & \varphi_4 \downarrow \\
H^1(X_{j+1}, \mathbb{Z}) & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{O}_{X_{j+1}}) & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{O}_{X_{j+1}}^*) & \longrightarrow & H^2(X_{j+1}, \mathbb{Z})
\end{array}$$

So in order to prove that φ_3 is injective, it suffices to show the following for every integer j with $0 \leq j \leq n-i-1$ because $\text{Pic}(X_j) \cong H^1(\mathcal{O}_{X_j}^*)$ and $\text{Pic}(X_{j+1}) \cong H^1(\mathcal{O}_{X_{j+1}}^*)$.

- (a) $h^1(\mathcal{O}_{X_j}(-X_{j+1})) = 0$.
- (b) $H^1(X_j, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^1(X_{j+1}, \mathbb{Z})$.
- (c) The map $H^2(X_j, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^2(X_{j+1}, \mathbb{Z})$ is injective.

By (C) we can prove $h^t(\mathcal{L}_j^{\otimes -s}) = 0$ for every j, t and s with $0 \leq j \leq n-i-1$, $0 \leq t \leq n-j-1$ and $1 \leq s$. Therefore we get (a) since $\dim X_{n-i-1} = i+1 \geq 3$.

Next we consider (b) and (c). In this case we need to take an $(n-i)$ -ladder carefully. Namely, we take general members $X_1 \in |\mathcal{L}|$, $X_2 \in |\mathcal{L}|_{X_1}, \dots, X_{n-i} \in |\mathcal{L}|_{X_{n-i-1}}$. Then $X \supset X_1 \supset \dots \supset X_{n-i}$ is an $(n-i)$ -ladder such that $X_j - X_{j+1}$ is smooth for every j . Hence $X_j - X_{j+1}$ is locally complete intersection. Here we use [5, Corollary 2.3.3]. Since X_{j+1} is an ample line bundle on X_j , we see that if $2 \leq i = \dim X_{n-i-1} - 1$, then $H^t(X_j, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^t(X_{j+1}, \mathbb{Z})$ is an isomorphism (resp. injective) for $t = 1$ (resp. $t = 2$) and every j with $0 \leq j \leq n-i-1$.

Therefore we get the assertion of Claim 4.2.2. $\square$

By this claim we have $K_X + (n-i)\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_X$. So we get $C(i, 1)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.2.1. $\square$

4.3 The case of $i = 2$

Next we consider the case where $i = 2$ and $\mathcal{L}$ is ample in general. Then we can prove the following:

Theorem 4.3.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$. Then Conjecture 4.1.1 for $i = 2$ is true.*

Proof. (I) First we assume that $C(2, 1)$. Then by the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 4.2.1 we see that $C(2, 2)$ and $C(2, 4)$ hold.

(II) It is trivial that $C(2, 2)$ (resp. $C(2, 4)$) implies $C(2, 3)$ (resp. $C(2, 5)$).

(III) Assume that $C(2, 3)$. Then we will prove that $C(2, 5)$ holds. In order to prove $C(2, 5)$, it suffices to show that $g_2(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$. By the assumption that $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = \mathcal{L}^n$, we get $(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1} = 0$. Hence by [5, Lemma 2.5.9] we have $\kappa(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L}) \leq 0$.

(III.1) If $\kappa(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$, then $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is one of the types (1) to (7.4) in Theorem 2.1 by Remark 2.2 (1). By [15, Example 2.10] and [17, Example 2.12] we may assume that $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a scroll over a smooth surface S because we assume that $\Delta_2(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$. In this case, by [6, (3.2.1)] and [10, (11.8.6) in the proof of (11.8) Theorem], there exists an ample vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ of rank $n-1$ on X such that $X = \mathbb{P}_S(\mathcal{E})$, $\mathcal{L} = H(\mathcal{E})$. Let $\pi : X \rightarrow S$ be its morphism. Here we calculate $(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1}$.

$$\begin{aligned} (K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1} &= (-H(\mathcal{E}) + \pi^*(K_S + c_1(\mathcal{E}))H(\mathcal{E}))^{n-1} \\ &= K_S c_1(\mathcal{E}) + c_2(\mathcal{E}). \end{aligned}$$

If $h^2(\mathcal{O}_S) = 0$, then $h^2(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^2(\mathcal{O}_S) = 0$ and $\Delta_2(X, \mathcal{L}) = (n-1)h^2(\mathcal{O}_X) - h^2(\mathcal{L}) = -h^2(\mathcal{L}) \leq 0$ and this contradicts the assumption. Hence $h^2(\mathcal{O}_S) \geq 1$ and by the Serre duality we have $h^0(K_S) \geq 1$. Since $\mathcal{E}$ is ample, we see that $K_S c_1(\mathcal{E}) \geq 0$ and $c_2(\mathcal{E}) > 0$. Therefore $(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1} > 0$ and this contradicts the assumption. Therefore there does not exist any $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $\kappa(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$, $\Delta_2(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$ and $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = \mathcal{L}^n$.

(III.2) Assume that $\kappa(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L}) = 0$. Let $(M, \mathcal{A})$ be a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. Then by Theorem 2.1, $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a Mukai manifold and by [15, Proposition 2.6 and Example 2.10 (7)] we see that $g_2(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_2(M, \mathcal{A}) > 0$. Hence by (III.1) and (III.2) we get $C(2, 5)$.

(IV) Assume that $C(2, 5)$. Then by the same argument as (III) above, we see that $\kappa(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L}) \leq 0$. If $\kappa(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$, then $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a scroll over a smooth surface S since $g_2(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$. On the other hand $h^2(\mathcal{O}_X) > 0$ because $g_2(X, \mathcal{L}) = h^2(\mathcal{O}_X)$. Hence by the same argument as (III.1) above, we see that $(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1} > 0$ and this is impossible. Therefore $\kappa(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L}) = 0$ and $K_M + (n-2)\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{O}_X$, where $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. Here we prove that $(X, \mathcal{L}) \cong (M, \mathcal{A})$. So we assume that $(X, \mathcal{L}) \not\cong (M, \mathcal{A})$. Then $(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1} > (K_M + (n-2)\mathcal{A})\mathcal{A}^{n-1}$ holds. But since $(K_X + (n-2)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1} = 0$ and $(K_M + (n-2)\mathcal{A})\mathcal{A}^{n-1} = 0$, this is impossible. Hence $(X, \mathcal{L}) \cong (M, \mathcal{A})$ and we get $C(2, 1)$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.3.1. $\square$

Corollary 4.3.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$. Assume that $\dim \text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| \leq 1$. Then Conjecture 4.1.1 is true.*

Proof. Since $\dim \text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| \leq 1$, we see that Conjecture 4.1.1 is true for $i \geq 3$ by Theorem 4.2.1. On the other hand, if $i = 2$, then Conjecture 4.1.1 is also true by Theorem 4.3.1. Therefore we get the assertion. $\square$

4.4 The case where $i = 3$ and $n \geq 5$

Next we consider the case where $i = 3$ and $n \geq 5$.

Theorem 4.4.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 5$. Then Conjecture 4.1.1 for $i = 3$ is true.*

Proof. (I) By the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 4.2.1, we see that $C(3, 1)$ implies $C(3, 2)$ and $C(3, 4)$.

(II) It is trivial that $C(3, 2)$ (resp. $C(3, 4)$) implies $C(3, 3)$ (resp. $C(3, 5)$).

(III) Assume that $C(3, 3)$. Then we will prove that $C(3, 1)$ holds.

Since $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = 2\mathcal{L}^n$, we have $(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1} = 0$. Hence by an argument similar to (III) in the proof of Theorem 4.3.1, we see that $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) \leq 0$.

(III.1) Assume that $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = 0$. Then since $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = 0$ and $(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1} = 0$, there exists a positive integer t such that $t(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{O}_X$. But by [5, Lemma 3.3.2] we have $K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_X$.

(III.2) Assume that $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$.

Lemma 4.4.1 *There does not exist any $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$, $\Delta_3(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$ and $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = 2\mathcal{L}^n$.*

Proof. If $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$, then by Proposition 2.1 $(X, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies either (1), (2.1) or (2.2) in Proposition 2.1.

(i) If $(X, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies (1) in Proposition 2.1, then by using [17, Example 2.12] we see that $\Delta_3(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ unless $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety of dimension 3.

We consider the case where a reduction $(M, \mathcal{A})$ of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety Y with $\dim Y = m \geq 2$. Then by [6, (3.2.1) Theorem] and [2, Proposition 2.5], we get the following:

Proposition 4.4.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a scroll over a 3-dimensional normal projective variety Y . If $\dim X \geq 5$, then Y is smooth and $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a classical scroll over Y .*

So we see that $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a classical scroll, that is, Y is smooth and $(M, \mathcal{A}) = (\mathbb{P}_Y(\mathcal{E}), H(\mathcal{E}))$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is an ample vector bundle on Y . Then in general the following claim holds.

Claim 4.4.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension n and let $(M, \mathcal{A})$ be a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$. Assume that there exists a smooth projective variety Y of dimension $m \geq 2$ and an ample vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ on Y of rank $n - m + 1$ such that $M = \mathbb{P}_Y(\mathcal{E})$ and $\mathcal{A} = H(\mathcal{E})$.*

(1) *If $g_m(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$, then $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 > (m-1)\mathcal{L}^n$.*

(2) *If $\Delta_m(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$, then $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 > (m-1)\mathcal{L}^n$.*

Proof. Assume that $h^m(\mathcal{O}_Y) \geq 1$. Then $\kappa(Y) \geq 0$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & 2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 - (m-1)\mathcal{L}^n \\ & \geq 2g_1(M, \mathcal{A}) - 2 - (m-1)\mathcal{A}^n \\ & = (K_M + (n-m)\mathcal{A})\mathcal{A}^{n-1} \\ & = (-H(\mathcal{E}) + f^*(K_Y + \det \mathcal{E}))H(\mathcal{E})^{n-1} \\ & = -s_m(\mathcal{E}) + (K_Y + \det \mathcal{E})s_{m-1}(\mathcal{E}) \\ & = s_{m-1}(\mathcal{E})s_1(\mathcal{E}) - s_m(\mathcal{E}) + K_Y s_{m-1}(\mathcal{E}). \end{aligned}$$

(Here $f : M \rightarrow Y$ denotes the projection.) Since $\mathcal{E}$ is ample, $m \geq 2$ and $\kappa(Y) \geq 0$, we have $s_{m-1}(\mathcal{E})s_1(\mathcal{E}) - s_m(\mathcal{E}) > 0$ and $K_Y s_{m-1}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 0$ by [21, Example 12.1.7 and Lemma 14.5.1].

Therefore we see that $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 > (m-1)\mathcal{L}^n$.

(1) If $g_m(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$, then $h^m(\mathcal{O}_Y) > 0$ because $g_m(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_m(M, \mathcal{A}) = h^m(\mathcal{O}_M) = h^m(\mathcal{O}_Y)$ by [15, Example 2.10 (8)]. Hence by the above argument we get the assertion (1).

(2) Assume that $\Delta_m(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$. Here we note that $g_j(M, \mathcal{A}) = 0$, $h^j(\mathcal{O}_M) = 0$ and $h^j(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ for every $j \geq m+1$ and $g_m(M, \mathcal{A}) = h^m(\mathcal{O}_M)$ by [15, Example 2.10 (8)] and [17, Lemma 1.6]. Therefore we get $\Delta_j(M, \mathcal{A}) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq m+1$, and by using Remark 3.4 (3) we have $\Delta_m(M, \mathcal{A}) = (n-m+1)h^m(\mathcal{O}_M) - h^m(\mathcal{A})$. If $h^m(\mathcal{O}_M) = 0$, then $\Delta_m(M, \mathcal{A}) = -h^m(\mathcal{A}) \leq 0$ and this contradicts the assumption because $\Delta_m(X, \mathcal{L}) = \Delta_m(M, \mathcal{A})$ by [17, Corollary 2.11]. Therefore $h^m(\mathcal{O}_M) > 0$. Hence by the above argument we get the assertion (2). Therefore we get the assertion of Claim 4.4.1. $\square$

Since $\dim Y = 3$ and we assume that $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = 2\mathcal{L}^n$, we have $\Delta_3(X, \mathcal{L}) \leq 0$ by Claim 4.4.1 if $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety of dimension 3.

Therefore we have $\Delta_3(X, \mathcal{L}) \leq 0$ if $(X, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies (1) in Proposition 2.1.

(ii) Next we assume that $(X, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies (2.1) or (2.2) in Proposition 2.1.

Assume that $(W, \mathcal{K})$ is the type 3 in [5, Theorem 7.7.5]. Then $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = 2\mathcal{L}^5 - 1 \neq 2\mathcal{L}^5$. So we may assume that $(W, \mathcal{K})$ is not of this type.

By Proposition 3.1 and the assumption, we have $h^j(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_M) = 0$ and $g_j(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_j(M, \mathcal{A}) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq 3$. By Remark 3.4 (2) we have $\Delta_n(X, \mathcal{L}) = \Delta_n(M, \mathcal{A}) = h^n(\mathcal{O}_M) - h^n(\mathcal{A}) = -h^n(\mathcal{A})$. Moreover by Remark 3.4 (3) and (4) we have

$$\Delta_j(X, \mathcal{L}) = \Delta_j(M, \mathcal{A}) = g_j(M, \mathcal{A}) - \Delta_{j+1}(M, \mathcal{A}) + (n-j)h^j(\mathcal{O}_M) - h^j(\mathcal{A}).$$

So in order to calculate $\Delta_3(X, \mathcal{L})$, we have to calculate $h^j(\mathcal{A})$ with $j \geq 3$. Then by Lemma 2.2 we see that $h^j(\mathcal{A}) = h^j(\mathcal{D})$ for every $j \geq 3$.

(ii.1) If $(W, \mathcal{K}) \cong (\mathbb{P}^6, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^6}(1))$, then $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^6}(2)$ and we see that $h^j(\mathcal{D}) = 0$ for every $j \geq 2$.

(ii.2) Assume that $(W, \mathcal{K})$ is the type 1 in [5, Theorem 7.7.5], that is, $(W, \mathcal{K}) \cong (\mathbb{Q}^5, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}^5}(1))$. Then K_W is a Cartier divisor and $\mathcal{K} = K_W + 3\mathcal{D}$. Hence $3\mathcal{D}$ is also Cartier. On the other hand $2\mathcal{D}$ is Cartier by [5, Lemma 7.5.8]. Hence $\mathcal{D} = 3\mathcal{D} - 2\mathcal{D}$ is also Cartier and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}^5}(2)$. Therefore by the Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem [25, Theorem 1-2-5], we have $h^j(\mathcal{D}) = h^j(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}^5}(2)) = h^j(K_W + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}^5}(7)) = 0$ for every $j \geq 1$.

(ii.3) Assume that $(W, \mathcal{K})$ is the type 2 in [5, Theorem 7.7.5]. Let $\pi : W \rightarrow C$ be the $\mathbb{P}^4$ -bundle over a smooth curve C . Then by [5, Proposition 3.2.1], there exists an ample vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ on C such that $W \cong \mathbb{P}_C(\mathcal{E})$ and $H(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{K}$. Since W is smooth in this case, $\mathcal{D}$ is a Cartier divisor and $\mathcal{D} = 2H(\mathcal{E}) + \pi^*(\mathcal{B})$ for $\mathcal{B} \in \text{Pic}(C)$.

Claim 4.4.2 $h^j(2H(\mathcal{E}) + \pi^*(\mathcal{B})) = 0$ for every $j \geq 2$.

Proof. Since $R^k\pi_*(2H(\mathcal{E}) + \pi^*(\mathcal{B})) = R^k\pi_*(2H(\mathcal{E})) \otimes \mathcal{B} = 0$ for every positive integer k , we see that $h^j(2H(\mathcal{E}) + \pi^*(\mathcal{B})) = h^j(\pi_*(2H(\mathcal{E}) + \pi^*(\mathcal{B})))$ for every $j \geq 0$. Since $\dim C = 1$, we get $h^j(\pi_*(2H(\mathcal{E}) + \pi^*(\mathcal{B}))) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq 2$. Hence we get the assertion of Claim 4.4.2. $\square$

By the above argument we have $h^j(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ for every integer j with $j \geq 3$. Hence by Remark 3.4 (4) we see that $\Delta_j(X, \mathcal{L}) = \Delta_j(M, \mathcal{A}) = 0$ for every $j \geq 3$. Therefore $\Delta_3(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ if $(X, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies (2.1) or (2.2) in Proposition 2.1.

From (i) and (ii) above, we see that $\Delta_3(X, \mathcal{L}) \leq 0$ if $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$ and $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = 2\mathcal{L}^n$. Therefore we get the assertion of Lemma 4.4.1. $\square$

From (III.1) and (III.2) we see that $C(3, 3)$ implies $C(3, 1)$.

(IV) Assume that $C(3,5)$. Then we will prove that $C(3,1)$ holds. First we see that $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) \leq 0$ by the same reason of the case (III) above.

(IV.1) Assume that $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = 0$. Then by the same argument as (III.1) above, we get $K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_X$ in this case.

(IV.2) Assume that $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$. By Proposition 3.1 we see that $g_3(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ unless $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety of dimension 3. Next we assume that $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety Y of dimension 3. Here we note that Y is smooth and $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a classical scroll over Y by Proposition 4.4.1. Then $g_3(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_3(M, \mathcal{A}) = h^3(\mathcal{O}_M) = h^3(\mathcal{O}_X)$ (see Remark 3.3). If $h^3(\mathcal{O}_X) > 0$, then by Claim 4.4.1 we have $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 > 2\mathcal{L}^n$ and this contradicts the assumption $C(3,5)$. Hence $h^3(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$, and $g_3(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ also holds in this case. Therefore there does not any $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $\kappa(K_X + (n-3)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$, $g_3(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$ and $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = 2\mathcal{L}^n$.

By (IV.1) and (IV.2) we get $C(3,1)$. Therefore these complete the proof of Theorem 4.4.1. $\square$

By Theorems 4.2.1, 4.3.1 and 4.4.1 we get the following corollary.

Corollary 4.1 *Let $(X, \mathcal{L})$ be a polarized manifold of dimension $n \geq 5$. Assume that $\dim \text{Bs}|\mathcal{L}| = 2$. Then Conjecture 4.1.1 is true.*

Remark 4.4.1 Next we consider the case where $n = 4$. By the same argument as the proof of Theorem 4.4.1, we can check that the following implications hold: $C(3.1) \implies C(3.2)$, $C(3.1) \implies C(3.4)$, $C(3.2) \implies C(3.4)$, and $C(3.3) \implies C(3.5)$.

Next we consider the implication $C(3.3) \implies C(3.1)$. By the same argument as in the case (III) in Theorem 4.4.1 we have $\kappa(K_X + \mathcal{L}) \leq 0$.

If $\kappa(K_X + \mathcal{L}) = 0$, then we can prove that $K_X + \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_X$. So we assume that $\kappa(K_X + \mathcal{L}) = -\infty$. Since $n = 4$, we see that $(X, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies (2) in Theorem 2.2. Then $h^4(\mathcal{O}_M) = 0$ and $h^4(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ because $h^4(\mathcal{A}) = h^0(K_M - \mathcal{A})$ and $\kappa(M) = -\infty$. By Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 2.1 we have $g_3(X, \mathcal{L}) = g_3(M, \mathcal{A}) = 0$ and $h^3(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^3(\mathcal{O}_M) = 0$ unless $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety of dimension 3. Therefore $\Delta_4(M, \mathcal{A}) = 0$ and $\Delta_3(M, \mathcal{A}) = -h^3(\mathcal{A}) \leq 0$ unless $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a scroll over a normal 3-fold. Since $\Delta_3(X, \mathcal{L}) = \Delta_3(M, \mathcal{A})$, we get $\Delta_3(X, \mathcal{L}) \leq 0$. But this contradicts the assumption. Therefore if $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is not a scroll over a normal 3-fold, then $C(3.3)$ implies $C(3.1)$.

If $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a classical scroll over a smooth 3-fold, then by Claim 4.4.1 we also see that $C(3.3)$ implies $C(3.1)$. By the same argument as above, we see that $C(3.5)$ implies $C(3.1)$ if $(M, \mathcal{A})$ is a classical scroll over a smooth 3-fold.

So in order to prove that Conjecture 4.1.1 for $n = 4$ and $i = 3$ is true, it suffices to consider the case where a reduction of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a scroll over a normal projective variety Y with $\dim Y = 3$, but not a classical scroll over a smooth 3-fold Y .

4.5 Some remarks

Finally we would like to give a comment about Conjecture 4.1.1.

(a) We can easily see that $C(i,1)$ implies $C(i,2)$ and $C(i,4)$, and $C(i,2)$ (resp. $C(i,4)$) implies $C(i,3)$ (resp. $C(i,5)$) by the same argument as the proof of Theorem 4.2.1.

(b) By looking at the proof of Theorems 4.2.1, 4.3.1 or 4.4.1, we can prove the following:

Proposition 4.5.1 *If there does not exist any polarized manifold $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $\kappa(K_X + (n-i)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$, $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$ (resp. $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$) and $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (i-1)\mathcal{L}^n$, then we see that $C(i,3)$ (resp. $C(i,5)$) implies $C(i,1)$.*

So it is important to know whether there exists an example of $(X, \mathcal{L})$ with $\kappa(K_X + (n-i)\mathcal{L}) = -\infty$, $\Delta_i(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$ (resp. $g_i(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$) and $2g_1(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (i-1)\mathcal{L}^n$.

(c) We can regard the following result as the case where $i = n$ in Conjecture 4.1.1.

Proposition 4.5.2 *Let X be a smooth projective variety of dimension n . Then the following are equivalent one another.*

- (i) $K_X \sim \mathcal{O}_X$.
- (ii) $\Delta_n(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$ and $2g(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (n-1)\mathcal{L}^n$ hold for any ample line bundle $\mathcal{L}$.
- (iii) $\Delta_n(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$ and $2g(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (n-1)\mathcal{L}^n$ hold for any ample line bundle $\mathcal{L}$.
- (iv) $g_n(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$ and $2g(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (n-1)\mathcal{L}^n$ hold for any ample line bundle $\mathcal{L}$.
- (v) $g_n(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$ and $2g(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (n-1)\mathcal{L}^n$ hold for any ample line bundle $\mathcal{L}$.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): By Remark 3.4 (2) we have $\Delta_n(X, \mathcal{L}) = h^n(\mathcal{O}_X) - h^n(\mathcal{L})$. By assumption we get $h^n(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^0(K_X) = 1$. Next we calculate $h^n(\mathcal{L})$. Since $h^n(\mathcal{L}) = h^0(K_X - \mathcal{L}) = h^0(-\mathcal{L})$, we see that $h^n(\mathcal{L}) = 0$ because $\mathcal{L}$ is ample. Therefore $\Delta_n(X, \mathcal{L}) = 1$. Of course $2g(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (n-1)\mathcal{L}^n$ holds since $K_X \sim \mathcal{O}_X$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): This is trivial.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Since $0 < \Delta_n(X, \mathcal{L}) = h^n(\mathcal{O}_X) - h^n(\mathcal{L})$, we have $h^n(\mathcal{O}_X) \geq 1$. By the Serre duality we see that $h^0(K_X) \geq 1$. On the other hand, since $2g(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (n-1)\mathcal{L}^n$, we have $K_X \mathcal{L}^{n-1} = 0$. Therefore we get $K_X \sim \mathcal{O}_X$.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (vi): Since $K_X \sim \mathcal{O}_X$, we see that $2g(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (K_X + (n-1)\mathcal{L})\mathcal{L}^{n-1} = (n-1)\mathcal{L}^n$ and $h^0(K_X) = 1$. By the Serre duality we have $h^n(\mathcal{O}_X) = h^0(K_X) = 1$ holds. Hence $g_n(X, \mathcal{L}) = h^n(\mathcal{O}_X) = 1$ by Remark 3.1 (2).

(vi) $\Rightarrow$ (v): This is trivial.

(v) $\Rightarrow$ (i): By assumption, we have $h^n(\mathcal{O}_X) = g_n(X, \mathcal{L}) > 0$. We also note that $K_X \mathcal{L}^{n-1} = 0$ by the assumption that $2g(X, \mathcal{L}) - 2 = (n-1)\mathcal{L}^n$. Hence we see that $K_X \sim \mathcal{O}_X$ because $h^0(K_X) = h^n(\mathcal{O}_X) > 0$. $\square$

References

- [1] E. Ballico, *Ample divisors on the blow up of $\mathbb{P}^n$ at points* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 127 (1999), 2527–2528.
- [2] E. Ballico and J. A. Wiśniewski, *On Bănică sheaves and Fano manifolds*, Compos. Math. 102 (1996), 313–335.
- [3] M. C. Beltrametti, A. Lanteri, and M. Palleschi, *Algebraic surfaces containing an ample divisor of arithmetic genus two*, Ark. Mat. 25 (1987), 189–210.
- [4] M. C. Beltrametti and A. J. Sommese, *Special results in adjunction theory in dimension four and five*, Ark. Mat. 31 (1993), 197–208.
- [5] M. C. Beltrametti and A. J. Sommese, *The adjunction theory of complex projective varieties*, de Gruyter Expositions in Math. 16, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, (1995).
- [6] M. C. Beltrametti, A. J. Sommese and J. A. Wiśniewski, *Results on varieties with many lines and their applications to adjunction theory (with an appendix by M. C. Beltrametti and A. J. Sommese)*, in Complex Algebraic Varieties, Bayreuth 1990, ed. by K. Hulek, T. Peternell, M. Schneider, and F.-O. Schreyer, Lecture Notes in Math., 1507 (1992), 16–38, Springer-Verlag, New York.

- [7] T. Fujita, *On the structure of polarized manifolds th total deficiency one, I* J. Math. Soc. Japan 32 (1980), 709–725.
- [8] T. Fujita, *On polarized manifolds whose adjoint bundles are not semipositive*, in Algebraic Geometry Sendai 1985, pp.167–178, Adv. Stud. Pure Math. 10, Kinokuniya, 1987.
- [9] T. Fujita, *Classification of polarized manifolds of sectional genus two*, the Proceedings of “Algebraic Geometry and Commutative Algebra” in Honor of Masayoshi Nagata (1987), 73–98.
- [10] T. Fujita, *Classification Theories of Polarized Varieties*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 155, Cambridge University Press, (1990).
- [11] T. Fujita, *On Kodaira energy and adjoint reduction of polarized manifolds*, Manuscripta Math. 76 (1992), 59–84.
- [12] Y. Fukuma, *A lower bound for the sectional genus of quasi-polarized surfaces*, Geom. Dedicata 64 (1997), 229–251.
- [13] Y. Fukuma, *A lower bound for sectional genus of quasi-polarized manifolds*, J. Math. Soc. Japan 49 (1997), 339–362.
- [14] Y. Fukuma, *On sectional genus of quasi-polarized 3-folds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 351 (1999), 363–377.
- [15] Y. Fukuma, *On the sectional geometric genus of quasi-polarized varieties, I*, Comm. Algebra 32 (2004), 1069–1100.
- [16] Y. Fukuma, *On the sectional geometric genus of quasi-polarized varieties, II*, Manuscripta Math. 113 (2004), 211–237.
- [17] Y. Fukuma, *A genelarization of the Δ -genus of polarized varieties*, J. Math. Soc. Japan 57 (2005), 1003–1044.
- [18] Y. Fukuma, *A lower bound for the second sectional geometric genus of polarized manifolds*, Adv. Geom. 5 (2005), 431–454.
- [19] Y. Fukuma, *On the second sectional H -arithmetic genus of polarized manifolds*, Math. Z. 250 (2005), 573–597.
- [20] Y. Fukuma, *Addendum: “On the sectional geometric genus of quasi-polarized varieties, I”*, Comm. Algebra 36 (2008), 3250–3252.
- [21] W. Fulton, *Intersection Theory*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete 2 (1984), Springer-Verlag.
- [22] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.
- [23] S. Iitaka, *Algebraic Geometry. An introduction to birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 76. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982.
- [24] P. Ionescu, *Generalized adjunction and applications*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 99 (1986), 457–472.
- [25] Y. Kawamata, K. Matsuda and K. Matsuki, *Introduction to the minimal model problem*, Algebraic geometry, Sendai, 1985, 283–360, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 10, 1987.

Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Science
Kochi University
Akebono-cho, Kochi 780-8520
Japan
E-mail: fukuma@kochi-u.ac.jp